

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Claim 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 are independent claims and have been amended. In the Office Action, Claims 6, 13, 19, 30, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to meet the enablement requirement. Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 19, 26, 30, 37, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-22, 25-33, 36-40, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious in view of Jolt. Claims 6, 13, 19, 23-24, 30, 34-35, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious in view of Jolt and further in view of Nazem (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227).

Applicants respectfully traverse all grounds for rejection, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-42 in view of the following.

CLAIMS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S. §112

(a) Rejection of Claims 6, 13, 19, 30, and 41

Claims 6, 13, 19, 30, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as nonenabling and indefinite, on the grounds that the specification does not describe how an account holder's level of customization can be greater than the user's level of customization. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The specification and figures teach that, in one embodiment, the level of customization given to the user is less than the level of customization given to an account holder, and that each user and account holder uses an "edit" menu to customize their respective pages. A comparison of Figure 8, showing an edit interface for a user of a second class, and Figure 9, showing an edit interface for an account holder, teaches that an account holder has additional "edit" buttons not available in Figure 8, the edit interface for a user of a second class. *See* Specification at p.23. Because the account holder may edit certain elements of a page that a user of the second class can not, the account holder is provided a higher level of customization of the page than the user of the second class. Thus, the specification clearly enables a person skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention, as recited in claims 6, 13, 19, 30, and 41. Moreover, in light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that these

claims are also not indefinite. Applicants respectfully request that the Section 112 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37

Claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the term “the account holder.”

Applicants respectfully submit that, for example, the usage in claim 1 of the term, “enabling a user of a first class to hold an account on the server” forms adequate antecedent basis for the term “the account holder.” Similarly, applicants respectfully submit that the language of the other rejected claims also provides adequate antecedent basis for the term “the account holder.”

While Applicants do not believe that any amendments to claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 are necessary, in the interests of advancing prosecution in this case, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 to make the recitation of this feature of the claims more express. For example, claim 1 has been amended to recite “enabling a user of a first class to hold an account on the server, said user of a first class defining an account holder.” Similar amendments have been made to claims 8, 15, 26, and 37. With these amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the Section §112 rejection of claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 be withdrawn.

CLAIMS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S. §103(A)

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-22, 25-33, 36-40, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the web site archive pages of “The Daily Jolt” (hereinafter “Jolt”). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The present invention is directed to a system and method for providing a customizable Web portal service to companies and organizations that desire to provide a Web portal site for use by their members, employees, or customers, but who do not have the technical or financial resources to do so. According to the invention, a provider of this service hosts and maintains a preexisting master Web portal site on a server. A company or organization that desires to provide its own Web portal site for use by its employees, member, or customers can obtain an account on the service provider’s server and can then customize a copy of the master Web site to meet the specific needs of its members, employees, or customers.

Advantageously for the account holder, the service provider continues to host the customized account holder copy of the master Web site on its server, thus relieving the account holder of this task. Further according to the invention, the employees, members, or customers of the account holder define a second class of user of the Web site and those users are also provided with the ability to create personalized versions of the account holder copy of the master Web site. The account holder and the users of this second class are each assigned their own level of customizability by the service provider.

The foregoing features are reflected in each of the independent claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 of the instant application. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites in pertinent part:

- (a) hosting, on a sever, a master Web site;
- (b) enabling a user of a first class to hold an account on the server, said user of a first class defining an account holder, and hosting on the server, for the account holder, a separate copy of the master Web site;
- (c) enabling the account holder to customize the copy of the master Web site in accordance with a first level of customizability; and
- (d) enabling a user of a second class to create a customized copy of the master Web site or an account holder copy thereof in accordance with a second level of customizability.

Independent claims 8, 15, 26, and 37 recite similar features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Jolt reference does not teach nor suggest the foregoing features of the claimed invention. While the two Web page printouts that form the Jolt reference show two distinct sites similar in appearance, those printouts do not provide any evidence as to how the two sites are generated or to what extent they are related, if at all. There is no evidence that a “master Web site” is hosted on a server; there is no evidence that the two Web page printouts are created by different account holders who establish separate accounts on the server and who are each provided with a “separate copy of the master Web site.” There is no evidence that such account holders are permitted themselves to customize such copies of the master Web site in accordance with any level of customizability that might differ from the level of customizability provided to regular users (*e.g.* students) of the Web pages. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the Jolt reference does not teach or

suggest these features of the claimed invention (*e.g.*, elements (a), (b), and (c) of claim 1 set forth above) and that it can not form the basis of a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the Nazem reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Jolt reference. Nazem discloses dynamic page generation and scalable retrieval of real-time information. Nazem does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the Jolt reference, the features of the invention discussed above.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 patentably define over the Jolt and Nazem references, alone or in combination. Reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these claims is therefore respectfully requested. Inasmuch as the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly from one of these independent claims, Applicants submit that they too patentably define over the cited art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the foregoing constitutes a full and complete response to the Office Action of record. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing arguments have overcome the rejections and place this application in condition for allowance. Early and favorable consideration and passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Date: August 11, 2003



Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439